

REMARKS

Claim 31 is amended. The amendment language is supported by exemplary embodiments of the invention disclosed by the originally-filed application at, for example, Fig. 14 and the specification teachings thereof.

Dependent claims 32, 34, and 38, are objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

New claims 48-50 are the above-suggested rewritten claims (of dependent claims 32, 34, and 38), and therefore, new claims 48-50 are in allowable form.

Claims 31 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Swapp (US Patent No. 5,172,050). Claims 31, 33, 35-37 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nakano (publication of unexamined patent application by Moto'o Nakano entitled "A Probe for Testing Semiconductor Integrated Circuits and a Test Method Using Said Probe"). Claims 33, 35, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swapp as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Leedy (US Patent No. 5,323,035).

Independent claim 31 stands rejected as being anticipated by Swapp and Nakano, respectively. Claim 31 recites the plurality of the projecting apexes engage only a single one of the conductive pads at a given moment in time. Swapp teaches a single probe tip 19 engaging a single pad 13 at any given moment in time (Figs. 1-4), not a **plurality** of projecting apexes engaging a single conductive pad as recited by claim 31. Moreover, Nakano teaches a single probe contact 22 engaging a single pad 25 at any given moment in time (Fig. 2(b)), not a **plurality** of the projecting apexes engaging a single conductive


pad as recited by claim 31. Consequently, Swapp and Nakano, singularly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 31. Claim 31 is allowable.

Claims 32-47 depend from independent claim 31, and therefore, are allowable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim, as well as for their own recited features which are not shown or taught by the art of record.

This application is now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-14-05

By: 
D. Brent Kenady
Reg. No. 40,045